

# The Religious Inquirer AND GOSPEL ANCHOR.

Devoted to the Exposition, Defence and Promulgation of the Christian Religion.

'THOU BEINGEST CERTAIN STRANGE THINGS TO OUR EARS—WE WOULD KNOW, THEREFORE, WHAT THESE THINGS MEAN.'

VOLUME XIV.

SATURDAY, JULY 25, 1835.

NUMBER 17.

## THE INQUIRER AND ANCHOR

is published simultaneously at Hartford, Conn. and Albany, N. Y. every Saturday at \$2.00 per annum—\$1.50 paid within four months from the time of subscribing.

I. D. WILLIAMSON, &  
R. O. WILLIAMS, & EDITORS AND PROPRIETORS.

Dixon & Hills, Printers.

The services of the following gentlemen are engaged as regular correspondents.

M. H. SMITH, HARTFORD, CT.  
J. BOYDEN, DUDLEY, MASS.  
C. WOODHOUSE, WEST BRATTLEBORO, Vt.

## A SERMON,

BY W. A. STICKNEY.

Original.

'From such turn away.' 2 Tim. iii. 5.

These words were originally addressed by St. Paul, to Timothy, whom he affectionately calls his 'son in the faith.' The Apostle, it seems had been instrumental of calling Timothy 'into the grace of Christ,' and of confirming him in the hope of the gospel; and this consideration, together with the undoubted and ardent piety of his young friend, resulted in forming an attachment on the part of the one, to the other, not unlike that of the parent to his child. Hence, the anxious solicitude of the former, for the usefulness, reputation and welfare of the latter. Hence, too, his faithfulness to the interests of his son, and those valuable, paternal instructions by which he so carefully sought to protect him against the corrupting influence of deceived and deceiving men.

In proof of the solicitude and faithfulness to which I allude, (if any evidence of them is required,) I need only direct your attention to the text in connection with the circumstances that called it forth.

The propriety of the Apostle's direction to his son, when all the facts in the case are known, will not be questioned by any reflecting or discerning person. It was given in reference to certain individuals among whom its author and his christian brethren lived, and by whose improper conduct, they were extremely annoyed and perplexed.

Although the brief portion of scripture which I have selected for my text, at this time, primarily applied to the early followers of our Lord, I conceive that it is equally applicable to all, who are similarly situated. The place of their abode, or the age in which they live, makes no difference in this respect, in the present instance.

Before I proceed to the subject of discourse, I would observe that the *sincerity* of individuals in pursuing an injudicious course, or in the employment of improper means for the accom-

plishment of their ends, does not justly secure them against reproof. If we allow them to be sincere, we must conclude that they are blinded, and driven on in their mad career, by a 'zeal not according to knowledge'; and, though they may vainly imagine that they are 'doing God service,' their conduct, so far as it is a departure from propriety, is not the less reprehensible, because they are conscientious; but should meet the decided disapprobation of every enlightened, christian man and woman. I do not mean that the individuals thus acting, are equally *criminal* with those who knowingly and wilfully sin; though ignorance is not always an excuse for wrong-doing. If they are careless of their deportment, or have neglected the means of information, within their reach, they are culpable for their inattention and remissness, and are proper subjects of reproof and instruction.—Because a man *thinks* that *wrong* is *right*, we are not under obligation to admit that it is so; neither, because he imagines that the holiness of the work in which he is engaged, justifies him in insulting his fellows, in trampling on their rights, and in outraging all sense of propriety, does it follow, that he is to be approved and upheld in his course, by those whom he insults and injures. I do not learn from the scriptures, that it is any part of religion to treat my neighbors and fellow creatures with disrespect; nor that I am privileged, by virtue of my piety, to disregard the rules of courtesy, in my intercourse with them; and I believe that the man who does thus, whether he be dishonest, or ignorantly honest, in his course, is justly obnoxious to the censure of the intelligent and virtuous portion of community.

Here, I would observe further, that it is not my design to reproach entire denominations of professing christians, for the faults of a few bigoted leaders and their deceived adherents.—With such wholesale denunciation, I have nothing to do. While I deplore the errors of these blinded and infatuated souls, and speak of their conduct in the language of reproof, I rejoice that, in every religious sect, there are honorable exceptions to my remarks; that, even in the ranks of those of whom we complain, there are men of candor and discernment, who as much disapprove the unchristian course pursued by their brethren, as any persons in community. I wish, therefore, to have my observations applied to those only, to whom they are applicable, and to be regarded, not as the out-breaking of malevolence, or ill will, but as the language of soberness, religiously spoken in obedience to the spirit of that command in which the Father of all enjoined it on his ancient servant, to 'show his people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins.'

The character of the persons alluded to in the text, and in reference to whom, the direc-

tion of the apostle was given, may be ascertained from the immediate context. Time will not permit me, nor will it be necessary, to extend remarks on all the traits he has enumerated.—I shall, therefore, quote so much of the connection, as relates to the text, and then select for more especial consideration, those particulars, which our circumstances, at the present time commend to our serious attention.

At the commencement of the chapter from which the text is taken, its author thus speaks:—'This know, also, that in the last days, perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy: without natural affection, truce breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high minded, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God, having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof; from such turn away. For of this sort are they which creep into houses and lead captive silly women, laden with sins, led away with divers lusts; ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth. Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth; men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith. But they shall proceed no further; for their folly shall be manifest unto all men, as theirs also was.'

1. The first particular which I shall notice from the foregoing enumeration, is: *Without natural affection.*

It would seem that St. Paul was not a believer in the doctrine of man's native depravity. That the persons of whom he spoke were in a 'state of nature,' was not the subject of his animadversion. What he disapproved in them was, that, by their views and practices, they had perverted the sensibilities and sympathies of humanity, and were *without natural affection*. Their moral condition was truly lamentable, and the causes that had brought them into it, could not be too seriously deplored.

But, my christian friends, there are those among us, who seem to be rapidly approaching, if, indeed, they have not already reached, a similar situation. What were the particular causes that operated to produce so dreadful a result, in the apostle's time, we need not stop to inquire. Our attention will be more profitably directed to a consideration of that cause which is evidently producing the same horrible consequence in our own community. This cause I affirm, and shall attempt to prove, is the cruel dogma of endless misery,—that wretched invention of man, which, at present, is so industriously and perseveringly urged on the attention of all classes of society, as the truth of God.

In illustrating of this part of my subject, I

need not rest on mere abstract principles: I may advert to facts. An artless, well meaning, young person, perhaps an innocent female, is decoyed from her way, and, in the absence of those, whose duty, more especially, it is to protect her, an attempt is made to excite her fears, and enlist her sympathy, by powerful appeals to her passions, in view of her pretended exposure to interminable woe; and to proselyte her to an inhuman creed! The unparalleled cruelty of the doctrine that is presented to her unsophisticated mind, and the gross selfishness with which it is urged on her consideration, shock her feelings. She replies to her officious instructors, that it is no satisfaction to her, to be assured of heaven for herself, to the hopeless exclusion of her honored parents, her esteemed connections and friends, and millions of her kindred nature! She assures these intermeddlers with her affairs, that her soul instinctively revolts at the horrible ideas they entertain, and she wishes not to have her peace disturbed by them. In answer to this ingenuous expression of a sentiment so benevolent, so honorable to humanity, so Godlike, her unnatural teachers inform her, that heaven and hell are at a vast distance from each other; that, in the future state she will have no knowledge of the situation of her reprobated, miserable friends and fellow creatures, or, if she does, that she will be divested of all those tender sensibilities she now possesses, and experience no sympathy in their sufferings. Thus a blow is aimed at once, at the most amiable traits in the character of the young, and a deadly poison is infused into the very fountain of domestic happiness. In this way, the doctrine of an eternal separation of human-kind, wherever it is received, operates to extinguish our 'natural affection' for parents, brothers and sisters, acquaintance, friends and fellows; to break up the most interesting, tender and endearing relations of life; to sever the strongest ties of consanguinity, and thus it tends only to alienate and estrange from each other, those who should cherish the most ardent and constant attachment. A doctrine more dishonoring to God, more tormenting to man, more destructive of the social welfare, or more pernicious in all its influence and consequences, never obtained the countenance of human beings. Take the worst representation that has ever been given of the 'Prince of devils,' and the assertion, that he is the author of this doctrine, were a libel on his character.

But what kind of a heaven do those expect, who give their support to so cruel a sentiment? A heaven in which they shall exult over the endless misery of their companions and friends in hell, or, at least, in which they shall be divested of every kind of feeling and sympathetic principle, and behold, with a more than stoical indifference, the sufferings of those who were once near and dear to them! My God! is it possible, that any made in thy image, who claim to be rational beings, can be so perverted in understanding, so deficient in judgment and 'natural affection'? I do solemnly aver, my friends, that I would rather possess the sensibilities which now give zest to social life, and a heart that feels 'for others' woes,' and go to hell to sympathize with my suffering friends and fellows, than to have any part or lot in a *heaven*, whose inhabitants exult over human misery, or are indifferent to the wretchedness of kindred souls! 'I would to God,' that those who live in the revolving anticipation of an exclusive paradise,

would pay *more attention* to their *Bibles* and less to their creeds; that they would strive to become better acquainted with the character of God, and the example of his son Jesus Christ; and cultivate the philanthropic and ennobling sentiment originally implanted in the human breast, instead of exerting themselves to eradicate every amiable quality of the soul. The savior, when on earth poured forth his whole soul in the most pathetic lamentation, in view merely of temporal calamities, and shared the sorrows of all classes of society; but, strange to tell, his professed followers live in the unshaken expectation of exulting in view of the infinite torments of men, or of knowing their misery without one compassionate feeling!—Truly, such people are without 'natural affection.'

2. The next particular which I shall notice among the things specified in the context, is embraced in the following words: *Despisers of those that are good.*

The representation which the apostle has given of those among whom he lived, is so apt a description of some persons of the present age, that I cannot but think they belong to the same class, and shall therefore, proceed directly to speak of them, under this head of the discourse.

I acknowledge that they make great pretensions to an ardent love of souls, and often manifest a feeling of tenderness toward those they labor to convert to their views and schemes; but it is evident to every careful observer, that all this is only *apparent*; the sum of their affection is a mere love of *sect*—of *party*. In the language of the apostle, I may say, they are 'lovers of their own selves.' The moment they discover that their attempts to proselyte an individual to their system of faith, are vain—that his views of God are too enlarged, and his benevolence too extended to suit their contracted, partial notions; and that he will not submit to their dictation, they denounce him as an enemy of God and religion—as an infidel and an heir of hell! Oh! is this that *charity* which 'thinketh no evil'—'which suffereth long and is kind'?—Where is their great *love of souls*—their ardent *affection* for those they deem in error? It is manifest beyond a doubt, that they are, in fact, 'despisers of those that are good.' I say this, not in the spirit of boasting, but in accordance with the principle which the Savior has approved and authorized, viz. that a 'tree is known by its fruit.' They are, emphatically, 'lovers of their own selves, boasters, proud, blasphemers, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, false accusers, fierce, having a zeal not according to knowledge.'

3. Another trait in the character of the persons alluded to in the text, is implied in the following words: *lovers of pleasures, more than lovers of God.* This is also true of those people of our own time, to whom I have referred. It is true, they talk much about forsaking the world, and giving up all for God; but it is equally true that all this is mere pretension with them. They do not hesitate to declare that they are, at *heart*, in love with all sin, and that if the benevolent doctrine of Universalism were true; or if there were no interminable hell in which those who do not here serve God, will be tormented without mercy and without end, they would indulge themselves in every species of licentiousness, to the greatest possible excess. How clearly, then, do they

prove the utter heartlessness of their religion? How certainly do they convict themselves of the basest hypocrisy, in their pretensions to a renunciation of the world, and to the pure service of the Most High! They are 'like whitened sepulchres, which, indeed, appear beautiful outward, but within are full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness.' They are 'lovers of pleasures, more than lovers of God,' and stand in most peculiar need of the regenerating influences of the gospel, to purify their hearts, and render them the followers of Jesus in sincerity and truth. I allow that they do not indulge themselves in the grosser vices, which exist among men. But why? Simply, (according to their own assertion) because their love of pleasures, is not equal to their *fear of hell!* But I have yet to learn, that a slavish fear of hell and the pure love of God, are the same thing!

4. The author of our text continues his description of the persons of whom he spoke, as follows: '*Having a form of Godliness, but denying the power thereof.*'

This, also, is characteristic of those to whom I have referred. Careful observation has convinced me that *godliness* with them is mere *form*; its *power* they practically *deny*. Am I required to substantiate my assertion? Permit me, then, to direct your attention, for a moment, to the course they are pursuing. Do you not know of instances in which they have gone to aged men and women, whom as for *years*, they might call their parents and grand-parents, and who have long been esteemed members of Christian societies; and, with a most insulting air, inquire if they have experienced religion, or if they do not wish to get religion? Do they go round and talk thus to each other? No; they would consider it the height of presumption, to speak in this doubting, disdainful manner of their own brethren. And what would they think, should I go to their *deacons* and *venerated church members*, and ask if they have experienced religion, or if they do not wish to get religion? They would deem my conduct a gross insult. Permit me to say, then that I view theirs in the same light.

Look, also, at their disgusting procedure in their professedly religious meetings. What kind of notes for prayer, are there read? I have heard some which read on this wise: 'A sister of the church desires prayers for an unconverted husband.' 'A brother of the church desires prayers for an unsanctified wife.' 'A brother and sister of the church desire prayers for two, three, or four, depraved children.' 'A brother of the church desires prayers for a sister who is unreconciled to God.' 'A sister of the church desires prayers for a brother, who is an enemy of God and religion, that he may be brought to lay down the weapons of his rebellion.' And who is this *unconverted husband*? this *unsanctified wife*? this *unreconciled sinner*? this *enemy of God and religion*? Perchance, if their lives were faithfully inspected, they would be found, (many of them, at least,) incomparably better people, in almost every thing of a moral nature, than these proud, overbearing, self-righteous Pharisees, in whose mock notes and prayers they are thus bandied about, in the house sacredly dedicated to the service of the Most High. But alas! they entertain *different*, (though infinitely more consistent and salutary) religious views, and are members of another religious society and denomination. This is

the 'head and front' of their offending, for which they are most ungraciously denounced as enemies of God and heirs of hell, by those who have, indeed, a 'form of godliness,' but [practically] deny the power thereof.'

As to depraved children, I should be truly sorry, if they were the hundredth part as depraved, as those, who have the charge of them, appear to be. They are, originally, as God made them, and as they should be; and, instead of traducing them in disgusting notes at church, and equally disgusting public prayers, I think it behoves parents to study the Bible more, and man-made creeds less; and endeavor to cultivate and bring into proper exercise, the Godlike principles which the Father of spirits has kindly implanted in the breasts of their offspring; and thus to 'train them up in the way in which they should go, that when they are old, they may not depart from it.'

5. The next thing mentioned in the conduct of the persons alluded to in the text, is thus noticed by the apostle: *For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women, laden with sins, led away with divers lusts.*

It would evince a want of candor, to suppose that the author of the text intended any disrespect to the female sex, by the language which I have quoted. The fact, that he found it necessary to use an epithet to distinguish those of whom he spoke, implies that there were others who were wise and virtuous; and there can be no doubt, I think, that he held such in esteem, while he compassionated the unfortunate victims of folly, who were duped by the artful and designing enemies of the truth.

The apostle spoke only of such as permitted themselves to be imposed on, and 'led captive,' by those infatuated persons, who, having too little sense of propriety, or too little of the spirit of men, to conduct in a becoming manner, resorted to the most base means, for the accomplishment of their ends; who, afraid to see a woman in the presence of her husband, went to his place of abode in a sly, covert way, or 'crept into the house' during his absence, to hold conversation with his companion and the younger members of his family.

I would ask, then, what greater evidence of her folly can a woman present, than in reposing that confidence in her *priest*, which rightly belongs to, but which she unjustly withdraws from her *lawful protector*? In what way can she better entitle herself to the appellation of a 'silly woman,' than in willingly permitting herself to be visited in the absence of her despised and abused partner, by persons that would estrange her from him, who, next to God, is her best friend? And what terms shall we use to express our disapprobation of the conduct of those individuals, who unasked, persist in intruding themselves into families, with whose members they are wholly unacquainted, and in catechizing them, in an abrupt and insulting manner, on matters which lie between them and their God; who labour to excite the fears and gain the confidence of the wife, and thus to alienate her from her husband, or, through her, to exert an arbitrary and unjust control over his affairs? who prowl about the domestic circle, and mark as the special victims of their deceptive schemes of proselytism, the tender objects, in whom are centered, the purest affections and fondest, earthly hopes of indulgent parents and nearest friends? Surely, if there

is anything that deserves the reprobation of the intelligent, virtuous citizen, the procedure of which I am speaking, merits the frown of an enlightened, christian people.

6. The apostle has further remarked, in reference to those whom he described in the context, that they were *ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.*

The truth here intended, is, unquestionably, the *gospel of Christ*. In another place, the author of the text speaks of the 'word of truth,' which he, also, immediately calls the 'gospel of our salvation.' It is, that God so loved the world, even when it was dead in sins, and involved in consequent misery, as to make the most ample provision for its purification and happiness; it is that the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world; it is that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself; it is that he hath no pleasure in the death of the sinner, but in the conversion of transgressors from their evil way, to righteousness and life; it is that he is *not willing* that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance; yea, that 'he will have all men to be saved,' and thus 'come to the knowledge of the truth.'

The counsel of God is immutable; the 'word of faith,' or *truth*, 'the gospel of salvation—which we preach,' cannot be falsified by the disbelief of those who are yet in ignorance of its heavenly principles. No; in the result of this scheme of redemption, through his Son Jesus Christ, 'God will be true,' and every man a liar, who has denied his truth; for 'his counsel shall stand, and he will do all his pleasure.' But there were those in St. Paul's time, who, though they were 'ever learning,' were still 'unable to come to the knowledge of this glorious—this cheering *truth*, 'As Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so did these also resist the truth;' and the reason was, as stated by the apostle, that they were 'men of corrupt minds, reprobate, [or void of judgment,] concerning the faith.'

It is even so now, with vast numbers of our fellow creatures. Though they spend half, and occasionally, for days and weeks, nearly all their time, in attendance at meeting, in exhorting and praying; though they are always talking about *getting religion*, and *experiencing religion*, and about what they call the *truth*, and seem to be 'ever learning,' they are still, deplorably ignorant of the first and most simple principles of christian doctrine. Their minds are so corrupted by false systems, by prejudice and bigotry, that their judgment, in relation to the most interesting and important subject that ever engaged the attention of mankind, is completely destroyed.

If you attempt to converse with them upon it, they will talk more like insane people, than like rational beings. If you assure them of your unbounded, filial confidence in the unchanging kindness and care of your Creator—of your firm conviction, that 'to die is gain,' because, when it shall please Him who gave you being, to call you hence, he will, through his infinite grace, and 'according to his abundant mercy,' raise you to another and better existence, they will endeavor to disaffect you with his dispensations here, recommend you to 'rid yourself of your present trouble, and go immediately to heaven by *suicide*,' and then impiously assert, that 'if they could persuade themselves of the truth of your distinguishing doctrine, they would set you an *example*.' If you tell them that God is our common Father—that all his designs

and dealings in relation to his offspring, eminently consist with the parental character in its absolute perfection, and, therefore, that he will not torment his children in hell, without mercy and without end, they will reply to you, that if such were his character and government, there would be no motive to induce them to love, and serve him, and that they would live in an habitual violation of all laws human and divine, as regardless of the horrible consequences to humanity, as regardless of the kindness and compassion of our infinite Parent. In this way do their corruption of mind, and want of judgment concerning the faith, led them to resist the most precious truths of heaven.

'But,' to use the language of Paul, 'they shall proceed no farther, for their folly shall be manifest unto all men.' The base tricks and theatrical contrivances that have been put in requisition for the purpose of forwarding the mad schemes of ambitious sectaries, have lost the charm, which, a short time since, gave them such power over the understanding and feelings of all classes of society. This is truly encouraging. A better day has, indeed, dawned upon us; and we rejoice to think, that the mass of mind which is now emerging from the darkness of past ages, is destined to experience a complete emancipation from the influence of the false systems that have been framed to enslave and degrade it; and that the period is approaching, when the rights of peaceable citizens will cease to be trampled upon, by a set of irresponsible ecclesiastics, and their deluded worshippers.

In concluding, I will briefly notice the direction given in the text: 'From such turn away.'

I apprehend that it was not the design of St. Paul to instruct his christian brethren to separate themselves entirely, from those, whose conduct he censured; nor would I be understood as enforcing such a view of the text, in reference to those among us, whose course we disapprove. No. As neighbors—as citizens—as members of the household of our common Father, treat them with all kindness and respect. And as religious enthusiasts and fanatics, give them good instruction and needed reproof, when they come about you. If requisite, 'rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith.' But when they commence their mad proceedings, 'turn away.' This I believe to be the sacred duty of every individual, whose eyes are so far open, that he can see the impropriety of their unchristian course; and I cannot but deeply regret that there are yet so many, who, while beholding their error, and even while suffering from their abuse, seem not to have sufficient independence to resist their aggressions, nor reprove them for their insult.—I appeal, therefore, to all, whether men, or women, who have not become so infatuated as to be lost to a sense of propriety, and I earnestly entreat you to discountenance them in their unwarranted course, both by your word and by your actions. Say nothing—do nothing which they can construe as evidence of your approbation of their unwise conduct, or justly turn to your disadvantage. 'Be not partakers in their deeds, neither bid them God speed.' AMEN.

For a man to see and acknowledge his own ignorance and defects; to pretend to no more than he really hath, is a quality which argues so much judgment, that there are but few better testimonies to be given of it. Charron.

## Communications.

## OVERCOMING 'THE WORLD.'

Original.

A. Oh my dear nephew—give up that fatal sentiment !

N. What ?—that God will eventually reconcile all things to himself ?

A. Yes : Pray don't propagate a sentiment of such awful consequences.

N. You are denouncing the sentiment of St. Paul. But produce anything from scripture that disproves it, then I will renounce it.

A. These shall go away into endless punishment.

N. If you show me this passage in scripture I agree to be converted.

A. Well, I will turn to it——

N. How does it read ?

A. 'These shall go away into everlasting punishment.'

N. That's better. Nothing contrary to what we trust, is stated Timothy 4 : 10.

A. But what essential difference is there ?

N. Enough. The scripture use of 'everlasting' is different from endless.

A. Still the Bible mentions an everlasting punishment—for sinners.

N. Very true, and I believe there is.

A. Then you are not a Universalist.

N. Yes.

A. What ! Believe persons punished 'forever, and then saved ?

N. Jonah was. Jon. 2 : 9.

A. Well ! This is what I can't understand.

N. The subject is plain enough. You have quoted some from the last parable in the 25th of Matthew, where the Jews, a nation of evil doers, were about to go into an everlasting punishment; which I believe has taken place.

A. When did it take place ?

N. During that generation in which the Messiah lived and declared it.

A. I believe the parable was to have a fulfillment at the day of judgment.

A. So do I.

A. But I believe it is hereafter to take place.

N. And I, that it has taken place.

A. Then you don't believe in a day of judgment.

N. Most certainly I do.

A. When ?

N. At any time :

A. This is too indefinite.

N. Well then, Christ says, 'Now is the judgment of this world.'

A. But do you believe in a day of particular and general judgment ?

N. Certainly.

A. When to be ?

N. Continually.

A. But do you believe in a special day of particular and general judgment ?

N. I do.

A. When to be ?

N. It is shown in the context of these parables.

A. What part, and when ?

N. 'Then' at the 1st verse.

A. That word points out a day of particular and general judgment ?

N. Yes, a 'special' one likewise.

A. And when this parable should be fulfilled?

N. Yes.

A. Well, I don't see.

N. 'Then' being an adverb of time must refer to something previous.

A. Tell me where.

N. In the 24th Chapter and in the paragraph commencing at 29th and ending with the 38th verse you will find 'the coming of the son of man' mentioned. Now do you discover anything about the precise time ?

A. This coming I have always understood would be at 'end of the world.'

N. 'The world' is something of an obstacle to be sure and that in more than one sense of the word. But here the difficulty is neither physical, political, nor moral, but nominal, or as M. S. would say, 'exegetical—philological' 'hermeneutical.'

It can be overlooked by the conqueror, astronomer, and Churchman, tho' to the latter it unavoidably occurs in the triple renunciation. And th' St. Paul 18 centuries ago witnessed the end of it, later theologians and a multitude of folk, from the women to very learned Doctors, are troubled in apprehension of the end of what they think yet endless. But, not to puzzle you further at present with what may seem an enigma, I shall agree with you that this coming was to be or 'would be' at the end of the world.

A. Your enigma, I think, has been enough extended. You say this coming is to be at the end of the world.

N. Was to be, I said.

A. What is the difference ?

N. If I maintain it has been past this 18 centuries, and you, that it is future, and are looking forward for it, is there not difference ? And the same difference as with the Christian and Jew in regard to the Advent—one maintaining it has taken place according to prophecy 18 centuries ago, and the other still looking for it as future ? Now the cases of the two seem to me exactly similar.

A. That would be difference indeed. But truly no one can suppose the end of the world has come yet ?

N. Yes, eighteen centuries ago. Why not ? you remember it was said then, 'Now is the judgment of this world—now shall the prince of this world.' In these instances it is perhaps to the abrogation of the Mosaic institutions and Jewish economy only, that reference was made.

A. I find there is something in this subject rather puzzling. I wish you would explain it.

N. Though but ill qualified with your leave I will endeavor to. Words we know, are signs of our ideas. We know also that the same word often is employed at different times to express different things. This is the case with the term 'world' and there are few perhaps in the English language so variously employed. Webster gives it 22 meanings, one of which only, he considers obsolete, and yet he omits one which is very important, and that will be considered by and bye.

A. What are his definitions ?

N. I will give some of the principle ones. 1. The Universe.

2. The earth. 5. Present state of existence.

6. A secular life. 7. Public life or society. 9. A great quantity. 10. Mankind, People in general, in an *indefinite sense*. 13. The customs and manners of men. 16. The Roman empire (scripture.)

18. The inhabitants of the earth, the whole human race. Here are ten.

A. And are there more than twelve more ?

N. Webster has twelve other meanings, and yet there are more. But you see from the number he gives in how many forms 'the world' may be met and overcome. We might proceed to cite examples of each, but it is necessary only to divide them into the following three classes. 1st. proper. 2d. Arbitrary. 3d. Technical. Webster's 2nd, tenth and eighteenth definitions would be included in the 1st. The fifth sixth and ninth would come under the 2d. And the sixth tenth and 20th and some others under the last. The reason I denominate one class technical is, certain classes of men employ them, so that when it is known what the persons are, it will be understood how they use the term. Thus the Roman, proud of his nation's empire, called it the world ; the religious sectary calls those who do not follow him 'the world.' &c. But sometimes for the purpose of deceiving, it is used with a 'private interpretation.' as for instance, by the Miser, who adopted it as the name of the chest in which he kept nothing, and was accustomed on proper occasions to say ; 'he had not a dollar in 'the world.'—You must by this time have discovered the term is applicable to various subjects : but in the 24th of Matthew it is applied to something different from all these.

A. Say what.

N. You know that the Christian dispensation is distinct from the Jewish ; and as one succeeds the other, reason teaches us that the one that was previous must have an end ; and this is what was referred to in the question on the Mount of Olives, stated at the third verse.

A. Have we proof of it ?

N. We have evidence amounting to proof in the chapter and the corresponding ones of Mark 13th and Luke 21st. You will discover in each the term 'end' is introduced, alluding evidently to the question as stated by Matthew ; though as being easily inferred, not stated by the rest.

A. May not the end of the world, and the coming of Christ, at the destruction of Jerusalem, be events distinct from each other ?

N. Yes. And so 'the end of the world,' the coming of Christ at the destruction of Jerusalem, and 'the destruction of Jerusalem,' may be all of them distant, and yet contemporary with that generation. The three Evangelists record the positive declaration of Christ, that all the things spoken of should be in that generation ; which you may see in Matthew, at 34th verse ; in Mark at 30th ; and in Luke, at 32d. I have other testimony for you however as soon as you dispose of this.

A. I must admit, you are correct—so far : but let me have the rest.

N. We have it mentioned by the prophets, particularly Daniel in the last chapter. It may however seem obscure.

A. Let me turn to it——No ; it is plain enough. This chapter I confess was always dark to me before.

N. You will find more testimony, at 1. Cor. 10,  
1; and Hebrews 9 ; 26.

A. The Jewish dispensation,—here it is plainly  
though alluded to.

N. No thanks however to the translators.

A. Why?

N. Because they render several different terms  
the original, having in sense no analogy or si-  
militude, by one term alone. And because in so  
many instances where *aion* (here rendered world)  
used they, as translators, use a term in a sense  
recognized by Mr. Webster.

A. I have been informed by a friend who un-  
derstands that, *aion* always means some kind of  
duration. Is it so?

N. It is. It always means some extent of time,  
or dispensation; and you may always keep  
in view, in reading the phrase 'the end of the  
world' in scripture.

A. Is that the case in the parable of the tares  
in wheat?

N. It is.

A. I suppose the expression 'this' world and  
which is to come, has allusions to the two dis-  
tinctions.

N. Yes. And I trust after this my aunt, when  
difficulties arise between you and 'the world,' the  
victory will be on the side of truth. Remember,  
is the victory that overcometh 'the world,'  
our faith: and in spite of the translators.

—ton, Mass.

J. M.

## INQUIRER AND ANCHOR.

SATURDAY, JULY 25, 1835.

**CONCESSION.**—Of all the various forms of  
attached to the christian system, that termed  
universalism has my preference. Admitting the  
thesis of living after we shall be dead, it is  
most consoling to the benevolent mind. To  
live, without doubt, that the whole human  
will at some future time be freed from im-  
fection, and made happy, is certainly a pleasant  
m; it is one which I have richly enjoyed, and  
faithfully, did I write in its defence.—  
the vision has fled—the book from which it is  
seen to be a literary salmagundi, and the  
posed author a capricious monster.

The above paragraph is from the pen of Russel Can-  
who in better days, was a believer in the christian  
ion and a Universalist, but is now, we believe, a  
med atheist. What may have been his manner of  
that time, whether such as would adorn the chris-  
tian profession, we know not; we are not personally ac-  
tivated with the man, and know but little about him  
report. It is some years since he went out from  
us, and of course the denomination is not now  
visible, either for his theory or practice. We made  
extract inserted above, because it contains the con-  
dition of an infidel—a living infidel—relative to the  
of the christian religion. The preference he has  
Universalism we care nothing about; but we do  
regard lightly his testimony as to the value of belief  
life of perfection and blessedness. If it was  
in sincerity and is the real opinion of Mr. C. it  
is what we have frequently said on the same sub-

'hypothesis of living again after we shall be dead,'  
though it as a system of mere human invention, is  
most consoling to the benevolent mind. We  
there is not a person in the world who, in his  
mind, does not desire life—and though every one  
he must die, sooner or later, yet even in the midst

of death he fain would live a little longer; and a little  
longer enjoy the society of friends, the endearments of  
life, the clear light of day, and another view of this beau-  
tiful world. But knowing he cannot, his desire, still ar-  
dent and enduring, turns to another world, and fancy  
paints a delightful scene which he wishes to enjoy.—  
Nothing but the gossamer web of a speculative philos-  
ophy can extinguish his desire; and even that only smoothes  
it for a little season, by perverting nature, and leaves  
it to break into a broader and more intense flame. To  
lose all thought and feeling—to die and live no more—to  
mix with dust and be forgotten—to sever all the ties of  
love and friendship—to part with friends and meet no  
more forever—oh! who can endure the thought? Not  
the simple child of nature whose mind is unentangled by  
the webs of scepticism. He dreams of heaven; and the  
hope of future life and enjoyment alone, can satisfy his  
soul. Dream though it be called, it is certainly a  
pleasant dream! And for the joy it affords, it is well  
worth the time of dreaming. Dream though it be, it is  
still full of consolation, especially when the hand of ad-  
versity is laid heavily upon us; and a dream, too, which  
Mr. C. acknowledges he has richly enjoyed.  
Allowing the point for a little while, that the hope of future  
life is all a dream, and God, a shadow, we may be per-  
mitted to ask Mr. C. whether in the visions of scepticism,  
he has found a better dream—a more consoling dream—a  
more enchanting shadow—a dream better calculated to  
satisfy his desires, to feed his soul, or soothe his sorrows?  
And we wish him to answer candidly and sincerely—not  
in malice, nor contempt, nor rudeness, nor haughtiness  
nor the spirit of controversy—not with the evasion and  
sophistry that usually characterize the systems of infidelity—  
and not for the purpose or showing off his own views to  
the best advantage, biding at the same time the  
ungraceful parts. And we ask not an answer according to  
his feelings in the days of prosperity—in a full flow of  
spirits, when friends are numerous and kind, and busi-  
ness prosperous, and the world glides smoothly on,—  
and he feels full confidence in his own wisdom, strength  
and facilities of enjoyment,—nor yet according to his  
feelings in the hour of dark brooding vengeance, when  
the ingratitude of some false friend, or the taunts, and  
contumely, and oppression of some unrelenting enemy,  
or perhaps the injuries he may have received, or imagine  
he has received, at the hands of professing christians, are  
goading him on in the work of revenge. Nor do we wish  
him to answer when pride, envy, anger or hatred, deep  
and dark, is rankling in his bosom. But when the storms  
of adversity are breaking in darkness, and gloom, and des-  
olation around him—when friends grow cold, and distant,  
and shun his presence—when afflictions come, and un-  
relenting fate cuts off all external sources of enjoyment  
and solace, and the soul, depressed and grieved, is  
thrown back upon its own resources for hope, and  
strength, and comfort—and when, in his hours of sober  
reflection, he meditates seriously on death—leaves his  
speculations, for a little time, and lets nature think—  
and think solemnly, that a few more years at most, and  
then—a blank—an endless, dreamless oblivion—we ask  
whether in these circumstances the dream of annihila-  
tion is better, more consoling, more pleasant, more ben-  
eficial, than the dream of heaven and happiness? We  
would that he would speak the truth in relation to this  
point in plainness and sincerity—though we can hardly  
expect it—not to fortify his own side of the question, but  
as if he were unabusing his mind to a dear and confi-  
dential friend,—that the world may know whether he has  
a better dream, than faith in God and the hope of future  
life and bliss—and whether he more 'richly enjoys' his  
present vision than he did the faith he so 'long and faithfully'  
wrote to defend?

If he does not, we intreat him, by all that is tender  
and humane, to let the world continue dreaming the  
blissful, 'pleasant dream' of faith, and hope, and heaven.  
Oh! who would wish to awaken the peaceful dreamers,

when their awakening is but to feel the sad reality of  
eternal night. Awakened, they may indeed enjoy the  
light of a transient day—the span of human life—a day,  
however, even less brilliant and delightful than that en-  
joyed during their pleasant vision; and then follows utter  
darkness, and blackness, long, deep, dreary, eternal!  
Blest with the assurance of sins forgiven and the hope  
of a better world, we say let them dream, and taste on  
earth the high enjoyment of the christian religion. 'A  
capricious monster,' is the Father of mercies? Any less  
a monster, is he who rashly attempts to draw the veil of  
eternal night over all the aspiring, heaven-born hopes of  
men? But no; we call not that man a monster; we lament  
his delusion, but condemn him not. Is heaven indeed a dream? Then let the happy dreamers enjoy their  
pleasant vision. For ourselves we choose to dream so  
long as we have full assurance that our religion is true—  
our hope well founded—our dream a reality. And cer-  
tainly we have no disposition to exchange this 'pleasant  
dream' for the cheerless and unhappy reveries of scepti-  
cism, until we can discover their superior excellence  
and utility. To us it is too dear a reality—a pearl of too  
high a price—to be exchanged for the narrow, baseless  
visions, that extend not beyond the limits of this present  
life.

'If lost the gem which empires could not buy,  
What yet remains?—a dark eternity.'

R. O. W.

**MERCY OF GOD.**—In looking over an old file of papers  
a few days since, we fell upon an anecdote reading on  
this wise. A zealous Limitarian preacher was exhorting  
his flock, to hold fast the profession of faith without  
wavering, and closed with something like the following.  
'Beware of backsliding, for when people once backslide,  
they are apt to fall into Universalism, and then the poor  
souls have nothing to depend upon but the mere mercy  
of God.' We recollect having read the anecdote before,  
but it brought to our mind, a few reflections which we  
propose now to lay before our readers.

First of all, if Partialism is true those poor souls must  
be indeed in a miserable condition. To depend upon the  
mercy of such a God, as is worshipped by those who be-  
lieve in partial schemes of salvation is like leaning upon  
a broken staff. In that God there is cruelty without  
measure, but his mercies are few and far between. He  
can hunt his children down to hell, and while they eternally  
writhe in torments unutterable, he can laugh at  
their calamities and mock their fears, but he cannot have  
mercy or save them from their miseries. We would not  
willingly trust ourselves to the mercy of a man, who under  
any circumstances could burn his children alive. So we  
would not depend upon the mercies of a God who  
could torment his offspring without mercy and without  
end. But we have reason to be grateful that such is not  
the character of the living God. His mercies never fail,  
and 'he will not disappoint the expectation of those that  
hope in his mercy.'

But there is another idea suggested by this anecdote. It  
comes in the form of a query, what else the good man  
himself had to depend upon? What else had he to de-  
pend upon!! asks the reader. Why he had got religion.  
He could tell an experience as long as the moral law.—  
He had united with a church. And more than all that,  
he could pray long and loud, and exhort sinners to 'es-  
cape from hell and fly to heaven.' Surely he has some-  
thing more than the mercy of God to depend upon.—  
Well, we will yield the point. When the mercy of God  
fails we shall expect to see that man, standing upon the  
sure foundation of his own experience and works. Aye,  
but will God's mercies ever fail? 'The mercy of the  
Lord endureth forever.'

I. D. W.

**THE SPIRIT OF ANTI-CHRIST.**—A few days since, we  
were called to attend the funeral of an aged and respect-  
able gentleman in East Windsor. Mr. S. Bartlett, the

Congregational clergymen, settled in the north parish in that town was also invited to attend—without knowing, however, that a Universalist was to be present. When he arrived, he was told by some of the friends of the deceased, that we were present—and was invited to go in and take part in the services. But he refused, even to enter the house, declaring that he could not consent to go in and hear a Universalist preach on any occasion, for it would be setting a bad example. And as to taking part in the services, he could not do it—he could not fellowship a Universalist Christ, he said, had no fellowship with Belieb, & he could not. Hence he turned round and went away without entering the house. He went away alone, however, for though there were many of his own order present; yet none followed his example.

Now let us look at this subject for a little while.—Here we behold a man so very pious—a grave ecclesiastic, so much holier than common christians, and so much better than Jesus Christ, that he could not, in conscience, enter the house of mourning and sympathize with the afflicted, because, forsooth, a Universalist was there! All his tenderness and sympathy—if he ever had any—were completely absorbed in his qualms of conscience relative to Universalism!—nay, in his deep, and violent, and abiding hatred of the doctrine and its professors. O tempora! O mores! How completely does endless misery freeze up every thing tender, and godlike, and humane in the human breast! How very like Beelzebub himself, in point of cruelty and malignity, does it make a man!

How much of the spirit of Jesus Christ was there in his conduct? Did he ever refuse to sympathize with the afflicted, because sinners were present? Did he ever refuse to associate with publicans and sinners, or those he deemed in error? Let Mr. Bartlett answer these questions, and then ask his own heart, whether he has not exercised the spirit of anti-christ? whether he has not been in practice, the very thing he condemned in theory, a Beliel?—and whether, in judging another, he has not condemned himself? We would that some missionary would come from among the heathen and christianize such men! ‘Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself?’ The divine Redeemer has well said of such men, ‘Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven!’

R. O. W.

**DR. BEECHER'S HERESY.**—Dr. L. Beecher, who was formerly a resident of Litchfield Ct., afterwards, of Boston Mass., and is now President of the Lane Seminary, an orthodox literary and theological institution in Cincinnati, has recently been tried before the Presbytery of Cincinnati on a charge of heresy. The charge consisting of various heretical doctrines, all specified, was preferred by Dr. Wilson of that place; and was supported by the published writings of Dr. Beecher. The heretical doctrines of which he was accused, were considered as departures from the standard of ancient Calvinism—they were doctrines, however, held in common by the New School divines of the Presbyterian church, and doctrines which Dr. Taylor of New Haven has attempted to reconcile with the old Saybrook Platform. A majority of the Cincinnati Presbytery, being of the new School divines, their views of course agreed with those of Dr. Beecher, and consequently the charges were not sustained. The Dr. was acquitted by a vote of a respectable majority of the members of the Presbytery.

This Presbytery has been one of the strongest of the New School; and being somewhat anti orthodox, the case was appealed to the Synod of Cincinnati;

which, says the Presbyterian, ‘will have a majority of orthodox men, when the Cincinnati Presbytery is excluded, as it will be, on the vote on the appeal.’ Then of course it is expected that Dr. Beecher will be found guilty of heresy. When divines who perhaps are prejudiced against him, and who are sensitively apprehensive that the cherished landmarks of old-fashioned Calvinism, will be removed, are to sit in judgment on his case, he cannot expect to find much favor. But there may be another appeal from the decision of the Synod to the General Assembly. And this, having a majority of the New School divines, will unquestionably decide in his favor. So that the Dr. after all, however much he may have departed from the principles of Calvinism in its primitive, unadulterated, state, will not be convicted of heresy.

There is much excited feeling on the subject in the Presbyterian ranks. The doctrines of the New School are gaining ground so fast as to disturb very much the equanimity of the old School divines.—Even now they can hardly contain themselves and unite at the same table with their more liberal brethren. A little more internal heat will produce an eruption. The accuser of Dr. Beecher says, ‘that party which is not sustained, must go out; for we cannot live together. The confession of faith must be put down, or the new theology must be put out of doors.’ We are not permitted to exult in the strife and contention of our brethren of the Presbyterian order; but really, we hope and trust that some good will result from their warfare. And we have the greater confidence, inasmuch as God has said by the Psalmist, ‘that the wrath of man shall praise him.’ We cannot be sure exactly see how, but we are fully assured that even the wrath and strife of the Presbyterian church will be turned to a good account in praising God, and in manifesting his glory among men.

R. O. W.

**DREADFUL CONSEQUENCES OF FANATICISM.**—We cut the following article from the New York Transcript of July 14, and we commend it to the attentive perusal of all who have heads to reason and hearts to feel. We have often cried to the people, to beware of danger; but they have slept on, and strengthened the hands of those who have been engaged in scattering ‘firebrands arrows and death’ through the Land. We are glad that the secular press is beginning to speak out upon this subject, in terms of rebuke that cannot well be misunderstood, and which we trust, will in some measure, stay the progress of ‘strong delusions.’ We give the article entire, and again we bespeak for it an attentive perusal.

Our readers will recollect an advertisement that appeared in the Transcript a few weeks since, describing the singular absence from home of a young lady named Reid who had suddenly left her mother's house in this city without expressing any intention to do so, and without saying where she was going. One of her brothers, a respectable mechanic residing at New Haven, Conn., was apprised of the circumstance of his sister's being missing, and alarmed lest some accident might have befallen her, quitted his business, and instituted enquiries after her in different parts of the country. About a fortnight after he started in pursuit, he succeeded in discovering the poor girl who, but a few weeks ago, was glowing with health and vigor, and full of intelligence and sensibility, at a distance of nearly three hundred miles from New York, unconsciously wandering she knew not where, harassed, exhausted with hunger and fatigue, destitute of money and of the means of procuring it, and a wretched miserable maniac.

And what will be said of the cause of this strange and sudden mental alienation, when we state that it was induced by the dreadful denunciations and blasphemous declarations of those who arrogate to themselves the character of being the chosen interpreters of the word of God, and his peculiar and especial favorites? What will be said when we assert, as we are constrained to do, that this lamentable ‘falling off’ in the mind and constitution of a young and lovely female, was effected through the means of a gang of enthusiasts—devotees to the most abject fanaticism, and agents for the worst and most dangerous purposes. Far be it from us to assail, or unjustly impugn, an set of professing Christians, of whatever creed, sect, or denomination. Such is neither our purpose nor our wish, nor have we any object in presenting the following horrible details—resulting from the indecent and outrageous importunity of a society of ultra-religionists to the passions and prejudices of a credulous, unwary, and inexperienced girl—but the ultimate good of the community, and in the fervent hope of warning the innocent and the unsuspecting from founders a rock so destructive to every thing of peace, contentment and happiness in the common association and intercourse of life.

It appears from well attested documents that have been placed in our possession, that the young lady above named, previous to abandoning her friends and home in the way we have described, had been persuaded, by a member of Mr. Finney's chapel, to leave the church she had long been accustomed to attend, and visit the place of worship superintended by the former individual. On her so doing, she was introduced to the pastor, and questioned her as to her habits, her disposition, her inclinations, and her religious feelings. To these interrogations she gave answers that would have satisfied any rational man, or any person whose motives were not impelled by an overweening, illiberal, and intolerant sectarian spirit. But however, did not stop here. Madly zealous in promulgating the doctrines he had espoused—doctrines which, peradventure, properly inculcated may be pure and worthy—he denounced her former mode of living in wild and frightful anathemas; pronounced her to be one of the accursed without the possibility of redemption except through his means, irretrievably lost unless rescued by his intercessions and entreaties to the throne of grace.

To illustrate the course of argument pursued to relate the various gross and impious expressions that were made use of; to expose the harsh and unfeeling language addressed to her; and to give a detail of the hideous and demoniac picture which they presented to her affrighted imagination, for the purpose of making her their prey, is a task for which we have no relish, and would impose upon the columns of our paper stigma, and a disgrace that we do not intend to shall ever merit. It may suffice to say that among the manœuvres which they practised, and the which they exercised, they exhibited to her a Hell and Hell Book, in either of which they professed to have power to record the irrevocable decrees of eternal happiness, or everlasting misery. So powerful were the effects of these repeated assaults upon the faith, and representations to the excruciating mind of the deluded girl, that she eventually became deprived of her reason, and added to the hapless crowd of unfortunates that now tenant our lunatic asylums,—victims to similar atrocities, and slightly wrecks of poor humanity.

Let religion be disrobed of the trammels which intolerance, and vice have surrounded it; let her remain untouched, and unsullied by vitiating designs and speculations of ambitious priestcraft; let her reign pure and unadulterate the heart, and there will be less of immorality and crime, and lunacy in our land.

**TRIAL OF REV. MR. CHEEVER.**—Our readers will less recollect the account we gave a few months since relative to this individual—the offensive article he wrote and published in the Salem Landmark entitled, ‘Inc-

Deacon Giles Distillery,' wherein he said sundry things that were considered a libel upon the character of Dea. Stone, a respectable deacon of a Unitarian church in Salem—the cowhiding he received in the streets in Salem, and the prosecution that followed. Mr. Ham, who performed the task of cowhiding Mr. Cheever, we understand, confessed his guilt and paid his fine. Mr. Cheever, however, on the prosecution for a libel on Dea. Stone at the law takes its course. His trial took place at Salem before Judge Strong, on the 24th ult., and continued to the 25th. Mr. Sprague of Maine, and Mr. Choate of Boston were counsel for the defendant. The indictment consisted of three counts:—

The first related to the language of the article entitled, 'Inquire,' &c. as being libellous, from its tendency to injure good morals. This was withdrawn. The second count related to the article as libellous, from its tendency to injure Dea. Stone personally, by holding him up to ridicule and contempt. The third count related to the article as libellous, from its tendency to injure Dea. John Stone, by representing his business as destructive to the bodies and souls of men.

To these Mr. Cheever plead *not guilty*. But after an examination of the witnesses &c.—and several Rev. gentlemen were called to testify to the good character of Mr. Cheever,—the jury rendered a verdict of *guilty* on the second count. On the third they were not agreed. But Mr. C. it appears, was not satisfied with the result; the case was therefore appealed to the Superior Court to be held in November next.

The following remarks were made by the Attorney General, Mr. Austin, in closing his plea in behalf of the State.

I acknowledge, gentleman, I was disappointed at the course taken in defence. I did expect to find this ardent, warm-hearted, generous champion of the Temperance cause, come out boldly, and say, yes, I did mean John Stone, and I meant to prove that what I said was true. I did not expect to see a learned clergyman put a FALSEHOOD into the mouth of his council, and disguise the real truth, and attempt to convince twelve intelligent men by such contemptible quibbles and nice-ness of law. Reverend and learned professors, and clergyman and doctors, have been brought here to prove that he is an *honest man*. But, I ask you, is this the way in which an *honest man* will conduct? This is inconsistent with the defence itself. The temperance cause is founded in truth, it holds no communion with base falsehood. A man of falsehood may claim to be the champion of morals, but he does not set a good example.

CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCE.—We were not less surprised than Br. Whittemore of the Trumpet—whose remarks we give below—on learning that this valuable religious journal is suspended for a season—perhaps finally. It has so long been a faithful watchman upon the walls of Zion, that we supposed it well established—well supported. It was certainly well conducted. But we need not proceed further with our own observations. We will suspend them, to give place to the following:—

We were greatly surprised on Monday last at receiving an *Extra* from the office of the 'Christian Intelligencer,' announcing that the publication of that very valuable journal is suspended for a time, perhaps finally. We are the more surprised, because we know that this paper was, up to its last number, one of the best of those which are devoted to the interests of Universalism, and because the Universalists of Maine, and every where else, where we have had opportunity of knowing, have spoken of it in the highest terms of commendation. We cannot but flatter ourselves that the publication will again be resumed, either by its late enterprising publisher, or some other person, that the very valuable services of Br. Drew, as an editor, may not be lost to us. There are Universalists enough in Maine, who now probably take no religious paper, to sustain the 'Intelligencer'

well; and it is only required that some method shall be adopted to bring their energies into operation. We shall wait with confident expectation for the reappearance of the 'Intelligencer.'

By the following letter from Br. Drew to the Editor of Trumpet, it will be seen that the publication of the Intelligencer is to be resumed, or another paper published in its stead.

Br. WHITMORE.—I thank you for the notice you took in your last of the 'Christian Intelligencer,' and of the favorable manner in which you was pleased to speak of that paper, and of my many years' connexion with it. No one could, more than myself, regret its present suspension—a suspension which you had a right to infer from the 'Extra' is, in the expectation of its publisher, likely to prove 'final'—or could have done more, in justice to himself or in honor towards all concerned, than I have done, to insure its immediate revival. I know, and all our brethren here feel, that such a paper in Maine is eminently needed—particularly at the present time; and I wish you to say to our brethren in this State and elsewhere, that measures are in progress for the speedy supply of the existing want, either by the re-appearance of the 'Intelligencer,' under circumstances satisfactory to our friends, or by the publication of a new weekly paper in Augusta, the Seat of Government. It was my anxious preference that the old paper should be re-established with permanent and regular habits; but seeing little or no prospect of this, and wishing to guard against an entire failure through that source, I have lately sent proposals into different parts of the State for a new one, to be called the 'GOSPEL BANNER AND UNIVERSALISTS' FAMILY MONITOR.' This paper, should our brethren demand its existence by their subscription, will be conducted by myself, assisted by Br. Calvin Gardner, of Waterville, and Br. George Bates, of Turner. It will be a full sheet, of the 'Trumpet,' handsomely printed (with an engraved head) on good paper; and no efforts will be spared to make it acceptable and useful to its patrons. The price will be two dollars per year, payable in six months.

As I have at present no medium of communication with the public, you will specially oblige me by notifying our brethren who now stand in 'suspense' for the want of the 'Intelligencer,' of the arrangements which are made to supply the existing deficiency. Persons wishing to receive the paper, who have not seen the Prospectus, can signify their willingness to aid in its establishment, by sending their names to the subscriber.

In haste, yours very truly,  
WILLIAM A. DREW.

Augusta, July 13, 1835.

SUSPENSION FROM FELLOWSHIP.—We perceive, by the last number of the Trumpet, that Br. Linus S. Everett, of Charlestown Mass. whose connexion with the Universalist Society in that place was dissolved a few months since, has been suspended from the fellowship of the Mass. Convention, by the committee of discipline, till the next annual session of that body. The charges preferred in the complaint brought before the committee of discipline, are not specified in their note announcing the suspension.—We are extremely sorry to hear any reason for such a course.

UNIVERSALIST REGISTER.—We have received a communication from Brs. G. Sanderson and O. Whiston, from which we learn that they propose publishing a Universalist Register and Almanac, for the year 1836. We wish them abundant success in the undertaking. The communication above named requests certain information concerning the statistics of our denomination in this vicinity which we readily give, according to the best information we have up-

on the subject. We presume a similar request has been made of all or nearly all our ministering brethren throughout the country, and we take this opportunity of calling the attention of the brethren to this matter. A Register of this kind, would on many accounts be valuable. It should be correct, and if the brethren one and all give heed to the request of the publishers they will be able to make it what it should be. Now Brethren we say, don't forget to forward to the publishers in due season, the information they need to enable them to give you in return a good and correct Register.

L. D. W.

ORDINATION.—Br. John A. Gurley, formerly of this place, (Hartford,) we understand was ordained to the work of an evangelist on the 5th inst. The sermon on the occasion was delivered by Br. A. A. Folsom. Br. Gurley is a young man of fine talents and good character, and we heartily wish him success in the ministry of reconciliation.

E. O. W.

ALLEGANY ASSOCIATION.—The Allegany Association met at Pike, the 24th of June. Br. S. A. Skeele, Moderator, and L. Paine, Clerk. A constitution was reported and adopted. Brs. S. Miles, J. Lewis and A Peck committee of fellowship and ordination. Brs. S. Adams S. A. Skeele, and L. Paine, committee of discipline.—Br. L. Paine Standing Clerk. Granted letters of fellowship to Brs. J. H. Sanford and J. Babcock, and conferred ordination on Br. L. Paine. Passed a resolution, unanimously, disowning the use of all intoxicating drinks, except for medicine. Minutes prepared by Br. Paine. Adjourned for one year, to meet where designated by the committee of discipline.

Sermons were delivered by Brs. J. E. Holmes, S. Adams, K. Townsend, L. L. Sadler, and S. Miles. Ordaining Sermon, by Br. A. Peck; prayer, S. Miles, charge and delivery of the Scriptures, L. L. Sadler; right hand of fellowship, S. A. Skeele, and addresses, K. Townsend. Messenger & Universalist.

#### REMOVAL.

The office of the Inquirer and Anchor in Albany is removed to the room over E. Murdock's store, directly opposite the Eagle Tavern, South Market st.

#### Religious Notices.

Br. I. D. Williamson of Albany will preach in this place (Hartford) next sabbath.

Br. R. O. Williams will preach at Durham on Friday evening July 24th, and at Killingworth on the fourth Sunday inst; and at Upper Middletown on Monday evening following.

Br. J. Shrigley will preach at Barkhamstead on the fourth Sunday in July.

Br. R. O. Williams will preach at Granby on the 3d sunday inst, and at Simsbury at 5 o'clock same day.

Br. W. A. Stickney will preach in Southington the 1st Sunday in August and a lecture in Meriden at half past 5 o'clock, the same day.

Br. J. Shrigley will preach at Poquonock on the fourth sabbath inst, and at Suffield centre at 5 o'clock same day.

Br. O. Williams will preach at Winsted on the 1st sunday in Aug; at New Hartford at 5 o'clock same day.

Br. F. Hitchcock will preach at Mount Washington Mass. the 4th sunday inst.—at Egremont at 5 o'clock same day; at Norfolk Tuesday evening 28th, at New Marlborough 1st Sunday in Aug. and at the West School House in Colebrook at 5 o'clock same day.

Br. W. A. Stickney will preach at New Britain the 2nd. Sunday in Aug. at half past 5 o'clock, P.M.

**Poetry.****Sun of love.****Original.**

King of glory, my salvation,  
And my strength, my hope, my guide;  
Thou art God in every nation,  
And in thee I will confide;  
Yea, and draw refreshing waters,  
From the fountains of thy grace;  
O may earth's remotest daughters,  
Thy redeeming truth embrace.

Lo! the Sun of love advances;  
See its mellow, cheering rays;  
Hope revives—illusory fancies  
Disappear before its blaze.  
How is love the King of heaven  
Stands disclosed to mortal view—  
Oh! what treasures grace has given,  
Rich, and free, and ever new.

Rise, my soul, and taste the blessing,  
Which the grace of God imparts;  
Cease, oh mortals! cease transgressing,  
Let his love attune your hearts.  
Praise the Lord in every station;  
Sing the honors of his name;  
Pay the debt of adoration;  
And his wondrous works proclaim.

AMINTA.

**Affecting Incident.**

Ellen was a lovely girl of fourteen, the eldest daughter of a once happy family. When the school hours were over, she would hasten home and sit with her needle work by her mother, or tend her little brother, yet in his cradle, or do whatever else was required of her, so kindly, so uncomplainingly, that her presence in the family was like an angel's visit. When she was about the house in her pleasant and quiet manner, her mother's brow of care would often be lighted up with hope and joy. She would sometimes sit and fondly gaze upon her daughter—after having listened to the sweet tones of her voice, while she narrated some little occurrence, some passing event, and as she looked upon her in all the loveliness of her young and unembittered existence, she felt all the affection of a maternal heart. And yet her eye grew dim with the rising tear—as she thought of the future; as she more than anticipated the woes which might, in coming years be the portion of her beloved child. But only a short time from the period of which I am now speaking a change came over the spirit of the mother; for a change came over the spirit of the lovely daughter. Ellen became pensive and languid. Her eye was sunken—her cheek was pale—her form emaciated, and she lay languishing upon her couch, over which her mother watched by night and by day, till the evening to which I refer. It was the hour of twilight.

The streets were getting still. All was hushed around the dwelling of—, where lay the wasted form of Ellen. She had been raised up in her bed that she might see the sun go down in the west. She watched—grew tired of looking. She had just seen his rays as they lingered among the distant hills till she was placed in a more reposing posture—when the very room where she lay became the scene of strange confusion. From the hoarse throat of the drunkard! was poured forth a volley of oaths and horrid imprecations. The room was filled with his sepulchral breath. The care-worn and bro-

ken hearted wife was rudely driven from the side of the dying Ellen.

The younger children were huddled together in one corner of the room—pale with fear, and their eyes red with weeping. The senseless, babbling, and noisy violence of the drunkard still continued. The breath of Ellen grew fainter and shorter. She raised her little skeleton hand and beckoned her mother, who stood weeping on the other side of the room to come to her. She came. The poor child had only time to say—“Why don't you ask pa to be still while I'm a dying?” These were the last words of Ellen—but they were in vain. With the last sigh of her gentle spirit there went up to heaven also the inhuman ravings of the drunken father. This story is not a fiction—not a story of imagination, but of real occurrence.—*Lowel Pledge.*

**The love of God**

‘The Lord loveth whom he chasteneth.’

I love to linger over and drink of the sentiments of the Bible. There is no book in the world half so rich in moral precepts, or sublimity of thought and style, to say nothing of the glorious and heart-thrilling revelations which it contains. But I shall pass over all this richness of jewels, and select only one from all its store—and this one is indeed a precious one. ‘The Lord loveth whom he chasteneth.’ Child of affliction dry up thy tears, for the Lord loveth thee. What is sorrow, or pain, or bereavement, in comparison with the love of the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, an ocean bottomless and boundless!

I have seen a mother bending over the little one whom she had nourished in her bosom, when it had refused its wonted sustenance. I dared not attempt to fathom the depth of her anxious sorrow, as its little brow became convulsed with pain, and its cry of anguish rang in her ears. I have looked again, and she sat alone in her chamber—her babe had gone to the dark abodes of mortality. Her look was a fixed, absorbed, inward look of comfortless affliction, and tear after tear fell silently from her eyelids. I drew nigh and whispered in her ear, ‘The Lord loveth whom he chasteneth.’ Her eye glanced upward, her tears ceased, and a smile of resignation, played about her lips—she murmured, ‘It is enough.’ The conviction that the Lord loved her was stronger than the pain of the chastening.

I have often remarked, in sadness the little feeling of affection, that seemed to subsist between brothers and sisters, or other near relatives, after time and distance, and the different allotments of life, had for a little while separated them.—They who, in their youth, have been as one; who have drunk from the same bowl of joys and sorrows; have wept and been glad together; whom one electric chain of sympathy bound; who recoiled at the same blow;—these have lived through separation, have had their affections weaned from those bound to them by such ties and birth and blood, and turned into strange channels. As the stream sparkles, not only among the hills that gave it birth, but glistens and leaps, in its course between banks, far, far away from the green sward, that its waters first knew; so the affections rejoice and lavish themselves upon strangers, to those who first watched their dawn—forgetful, perhaps, of the objects of their earliest, purest exercise. It is sad, for

young hearts to believe, that the love they now bear each other must one day become rather a matter of judgment and duty, than an impulse of the heart; that the same fate probably awaits their affections, that has come to thousands equally near and dear. The brother must reflect that soon he must yield his right of prior attachment to those who, picked up midway in the journey of life, yet have better claims to love and sympathy on to the end of the voyage. Time and distance are the great enemies of mutual affection; and although it is only when we have first left our friends, that we know how dear they are to us, yet we love them best when we are feeding from the same table—sleeping under the same roof—in the daily reciprocations of favors, and the hourly manifestations of interest and affection. Still much may be done to counteract the common influences of life. It is a narrow philosophy that circumscribes the affections of the heart—declaring that it is only capable of transferring its love from one to another; not of enlarging greatly the number of the objects of its regard. Far otherwise; the soul expands more and more, with every effort of kindness; it cannot be crowded; like that spirit of universal benevolence, whose sublimity consists more in his infinite love for the whole world, than in power or might—that part of us, which stamps us with the image of our Maker; elevates itself more by the outpourings of its affections, than by any exercise of intellectual power.

N. E. Magazine.

**Dr. Ely's opinion of a judgment.**

In the second letter of his controversy with Br. Thomas, the Dr. says; ‘I believe that a particular personal judgment passes on each spirit of man as soon as it permanently leaves the body.’

From this it appears that the Dr. has abandoned the idea of a general judgment. We are confirmed in this opinion, from the fact that in stating the particulars of his faith, he has stated nothing but the quotation we have made. We have ever regarded the common notions of judgment as unreasonable and inconsistent in the highest degree and we hope, if the Doctor has abandoned them, he will give his reasons for so doing to the world.

But this change of faith will throw the Dr. into a sad dilemma. He will be compelled to give up some of his favorite texts against Universalism. The passage ‘God has appointed a day in which he will judge the world,’ the Dr. must explain as do the Universalists. So with the parable of the sheep and goats; neither of these texts will have any bearing against Universalism, unless it applies to a judgment in the eternal world; a judgment at which the whole universe shall be assembled. What will Dr. E. say to these things.—*Pioneer.*

**UNIVERSALIST BOOKS.**

STREETERS' Hymns, Paiges' Selections, Life of Murray, Ballous' Lectures, Ballou's Notes, &c. &c. For sale by

BELKNAP & HAMERSLEY,  
Exchange Buildings.

B. & H. keep constantly on hand a general assortment of books and stationary, which will be sold on favorable terms.

Hartford, June 24, 1835.

Steowl3

THE OFFICE of the Inquirer and Anchor is removed to the building formerly owned and occupied by Mr. N. Ruggles in Main St. a few rods south west of the State House square.